

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 19, 1999 LB 637

all by ourselves? It's going to take a coalition of all the states to do that to the federal government when they come down with these mandates, telling us we have to do these things. If enough of us get together and say we're not going to accept that, what can they do? What can they do to all of us? Because then they'll have to realize that they represent us back in Washington. That's just not another... a separate country where they're the ultimate rulers. So again, I don't like what we're doing, what's happening here, but I think this gentleman from Washington was back here last week, I think his name was Ross also, former judge who administered the program, said that we will definitely... it's not a question of whether we will or will not lose the \$15 million, that's a given. Then a year from now, what worries me more than that, is losing this TANF funds. He said about a year from now you will be losing those, and that's a big dollar item, that's about \$58 million. So again, as far as principle is concerned, I totally agree that we shouldn't give in to them. But I'm having a little problem with the dollars we'll lose, and perhaps we can find another avenue. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Engel. Senator Redfield, for discussion on the bracket motion.

SENATOR REDFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the body. I have been following the debate carefully as we have gone through. And I hear the concerns that are being expressed by my colleagues. The thing that I don't understand, as we have expressed those things, is what we will gain with a bracket motion. And, Senator Chambers, I'm going to ask you, in a few minutes, if you would address that. Quite honestly, I'm hearing people say this is a bad bill, this is a flawed bill. Well, if that's true, then we have a choice. We can either kill it, or we can fix it. But to study it is not a bad idea, unless studying it only puts us in the same position, that we are now, a little bit later. If we're talking about locking at fixing the bill over another few weeks, then that makes sense, working out the details, or killing it outright. But it doesn't make sense to come back, next January, after we have already faced the fact of the sanction and missed our October deadline. Now I also heard a question expressed that they didn't know that we could even accommodate all of the issues that need to be